



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/982,194	10/19/2001	Christoph Heckenkamp	BEU/HECK3001	7979

23364 7590 08/19/2002

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 SLATERS LANE
FOURTH FLOOR
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

ASSAF, FAYEZ G

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2872

DATE MAILED: 08/19/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/982,194

Applicant(s)

HECKENKAMP ET AL.

Examiner

Fayez G. Assaf

Art Unit

2872

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-76 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-7, 33, 36-48 and 60-76 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-10, 13-32, 34, 35, 49-59 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11 and 12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/023,430.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2872

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of invention IV: claims 9-21, 22-32, 34-42, 49-64, 66-67, and having claim 8 linking claims I-V in Paper No. 6 is acknowledged. However, it appears that some claims were erroneously placed, by the Examiner, under invention IV, because they recite series or multiplicity of data carriers which is pertinent to other invention(s). As such, these claims are withdrawn from consideration. Presently, the status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 8-32, 34, 35 and 49-59 read on invention IV.

Claims 1-7, 33, 36-48 and 60-76 are withdrawn from consideration.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed on 6/26/2002 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed.

Art Unit: 2872

The references, which have been considered, were initialed by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 8, 9, ¹⁶15-21, 22-25, 27, 28, 29, 31, 35, 36 and 49-52 and 54-59 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sander (US 4629647).

Regarding claims 8, 16, 17, 22-25, 27, 28, 31, 35, 36 and 49-52, 55-57 and 59, Sander discloses a data carrier (see Fig. 2) which is manufactured and thereafter issued for use, the data carrier having a body provided with a multiplayer, optically variable element comprising metal diffraction structures (4 of Fig. 2), the diffraction structures presenting visually recognizable information (line 16 to line 18 of Col. 2), wherein the data carrier is provided with an alteration in a portion of the optically variable element, the alteration comprising a modification of the contour of the diffraction structures (by

Art Unit: 2872

9b's of Fig. 2). The alteration comprising replacing the diffractive structures by nondiffractive structures in at least one partial area, or partially removing of at least one layer of optically variable element (see 8b, 9b and 10b of Fig. 2). The alteration comprising a coloration of at least one layer of the optically variable element (line 29 to line 33 of Col. 5). It is noted that the optically variable element comprises a metal layer (9b's in the layer are not contiguous, i.e. metal layer being partially removed).

Regarding claim 9, 18-21, 54, 58 Sander discloses the contour being a line structure provided in the form of positive or negative print (line 48 to line 62 of Col. 8) having a transparent luminescent substance (10b's of Fig. 2), and overlapping or in alignment with the variable optical element.

Regarding claim 13, Sander discloses the optical element comprising an at least partly permeable reflective layer (all layers are inherently partly permeable and reflective).

Regarding claim 15, Sander discloses the metal pattern being a grid (line 52 of Col. 8).

Regarding claim 29, Sander discloses the optically variable element comprising a protective colored lacquer (9b's of Fig. 2).

Art Unit: 2872

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 26, 30, 32 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Sander.

Regarding claims 26, 30 and 53, Applicant is claiming the product including the process of making the alteration by means of laser beam, and therefore is of "product-by-process" nature. The courts have been holding for quite some time that: the determination of the patentability of product-by-process claim is based on the product itself rather than on the process by which the product is made. In re Thrope, 777 F. 2d 695, 277 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985); and patentability of claim to a product does not rest merely on a difference in the method by which that product is made. Rather, it is the product itself which must be new and unobvious. Applicant has chosen to claim the invention in the product form. Thus a prior art product which possesses the claimed product characteristic can

Art Unit: 2872

anticipate or render obvious the claim subject matter regardless of the manner in which is fabricate. A rejection based on 35 USC section 102 or alternatively on 35 USC section 103 of the status is eminently fail and acceptable. In re Brown and Safer, 173 USPQ 685 and 688; In re Pilkington, 162 USPQ 147.

Regarding claim 32, sander discloses the claimed invention except for the metal layer comprising copper, silver or gold. However, such choice of material can be determined by routine experimentation.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize such well known materials, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 11 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 11 and 12 are allowable over the prior art for at least the reason that the prior art fails to teach or reasonably

Art Unit: 2872

suggest the arrangement of the diffraction structure as set forth in the claimed combination.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Fayez Assaf whose telephone number is (703) 306-5526. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-7722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



Fayez Assaf

8/14/02



**Cassandra Spyrou
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800**